DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 332 340 EA 022 997

AUTHOR Murphy, Joseph
TITLE Preparing School Administrators for the Twenty-First Century: The Reform Agenda. NCEL Occasional Paper No. 2.
INSTITUTION Harvard Univ., Cambridge, Mass. Graduate School of Education.; National Center for Educational Leadership, Cambridge, MA.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Apr 90
CONTRACT R117C80005
NOTE 52p.
AVAILABLE FROM Publication Sales, National Center for Educational Leadership, Harvard Graduate School of Education, 443 Gutman Library, 6 Appian Way, Cambridge, MA 02138 ($4.00).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Change; *Administrator Education; Administrator Qualifications; Administrator Responsibility; Administrator Role; *Administrators; Administrator Selection; Educational Needs; Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; Futures (of Society); Higher Education; Instructional Leadership; *Leadership Training; Literature Reviews; Professional Development; *School Administration; Standards

ABSTRACT

Focusing on the call for changes in school administration, this document reviews the nature of the educational reform movement in the 1980s before describing four trends that have fueled reform proposals. Trends described include general conditions such as the larger reform debate and the new conceptions of the appropriate organizational structure for schools as well as conditions specific to school administrators such as lessons learned from successful schools and dissatisfaction with the status quo. With reference to existing reform reports, this document explores the need for reform in the leadership, professionalism, and standards of educational administration by discussing the following areas of concern: (1) the direction of reform efforts; (2) the need for instructional focus; (3) the establishment of a professional knowledge base; (4) the need for a professional model of delivery; (5) administrator recruitment; (6) preparation program content; (7) preparation program structure; (8) monitoring progress; (9) certification standards; (10) employment standards; and (11) standards of professional development for practicing school administrators. Last, the necessity of bringing administrative programs and educational leaders' views in line with a child-centered educational agenda is discussed. Appended is a list of the 32 reform reports and studies analyzed. (108 references) (CLA)

ED332340

NCEL

The National Center for Educational Leadership

Preparing School Administrators for the Twenty-First Century: The Reform Agenda

by

Joseph Murphy
Vanderbilt University

Occasional Paper No. 2

April 1990

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
K. Miles
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EA 022 997

NCEL

The National Center for Educational Leadership

The National Center for Educational Leadership is funded by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U. S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C., Grant No. R117C80005. The opinions expressed in this paper are those of the author, and not necessarily those of the funding agency.

Additional copies of this paper are available at a cost of ~~$2.00~~ 4.00 from:

The National Center for Education Leadership
Harvard Graduate School of Education
443 Gutman Library
6 Appian Way
Cambridge, MA 02138

Harvard Graduate School of Education
Gutman Library, 4th floor
6 Appian Way
Cambridge, MA 02138
(617) 495-3575

George Peabody College of Education
Box 514
Vanderbilt University
Nashville, TN 37203
(615) 322-8014

The University of Chicago
Department of Education
5835 Kimbark Avenue
Chicago, IL 60637
(312) 702-1566

NCEL OCCASIONAL PAPER SERIES

1. *Re-Thinking School Leadership: An Agenda for Research and Reform* by Lee G. Bolman, Susan Moore Johnson, Jerome T. Murphy, and Carol H. Weiss; Harvard University (February 1990)

   This paper presents a basic model of the relationship between leadership, situation, and outcomes. Personal characteristics of leaders and the situation in which leaders find themselves both influence what leaders do, which in turn influences the kinds of outcomes that they produce. Embedded in the model are three questions: "What is good school leadership?" "How does good school leadership come about?" and "What will good school leadership mean in the future?" Systematic ways of approaching these questions are also presented.

2. *Preparing School Administrators for the Twenty-First Century: The Reform Agenda* by Joseph Murphy; Vanderbilt University (May 1990)

   In the second wave of school reform reports and studies of the 1980s, much attention has been directed to issues of school administration and leadership. Yet, to date, no comprehensive analysis of these calls for changes in school administration has been undertaken. The purpose of this paper is to provide such a review. The goals of the paper are threefold: (1) to explain the reasons for the calls for reform of school administration, (2) to review the major studies and reports on education reform from 1982 to 1988 and (3) to discuss educational administration reform issues that need further attention.

3. *What Makes a Difference? School Context, Principal Leadership, and Student Achievement* by Philip Hallinger, Leonard Bickman, and Ken Davis; Vanderbilt University (June 1990)

   This paper addresses the general question, what makes a difference in school learning? We report the results of a secondary analysis of data collected as part of the Tennessee School Improvement Incentives Project. We utilized the instructional leadership model developed by researchers at the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development to guide our analyses. This conceptual model makes provision for analysis of principal leadership in relation to features of the school environment, school-level organization, and student outcomes. The paper focuses on the following research questions: (1) What antecedents appear to influence principal leadership behavior? (2) What impact does principal leadership have on the organization and its outcomes? (3) To what extent is the Far West Lab instructional leadership framework supported empirically by the data collected in this study?

4. *The Teaching Project at the Edward Devotion School: A Case Study of a Teacher-Initiated Restructuring Project* by Katherine C. Boles; Harvard University (September 1990)

   School districts around the country are in the process of initiating projects to restructure their schools. A small but growing number of these restructuring projects have been initiated by teachers, but as yet little has been written documenting the experience of classroom practitioners involved in such efforts. The purpose of this study is to add teachers' voices to the literature on restructuring. This project restructured a portion of a school and altered the work of a group of third and fourth grade teachers.

5. *Educational Reform in the 1980s: Explaining Some Surprising Success* by Joseph Murphy; Vanderbilt University (September 1990)

In this paper issues of success and failure of reform initiatives are discussed from both sides of the aisle. The paper begins with a review of the financial, political, and organizational factors which normally support the position that reform measures are likely to result in few substantive improvements. Next the argument is made that educational reform recommendations have been surprisingly successful, and some speculations as to the reasons for this unexpected outcome are presented.

6. *New Settings and Changing Norms for Principal Development* by Philip Hallinger; Vanderbilt University and Robert Wimpelberg; University of New Orleans (January 1991)

Recently analysts have identified a variety of features that distinguish emerging administrative training programs from traditional ones. The rapid, but non-systematic growth in organizations providing administrative development services during the 1980's led to considerable natural variation in programmatic content as well as in organizational processes. In particular, significant variations emerged in the operation of state sponsored leadership academies and local principals' centers. The purpose of this paper is to analyze variations in current approaches to educational leadership development. The paper addresses three questions: (1) What is the range of variation among emerging staff development programs for school leaders on dimensions of program content and organizational process? (2) What can we learn from the naturally occurring variations in administrative development? (3) What are the most likely and promising directions for administrative development programs in the next decade?

7. *Images of Leadership* by Lee G. Bolman; Harvard University and Terrence E. Deal; Vanderbilt University (January 1991)

This project has undertaken a major study of the "frames", or orientations that leaders use to guide their understanding of their work. The investigators have developed a set of survey instruments to measure four leadership orientations (structural, human resource, political, and symbolic), and collected data from leaders approach their task constituents in both education and the private sector. Their research results show that the four leadership orientations do capture significant elements of how leaders approach their task, and that those leadership variables are significantly associated with effectiveness. The results further show that the variables which predict effectiveness as a *manager* are different from those that predict effectiveness as a *leader*. In particular, structural and rational orientations are primarily predictive of manager effectiveness. This research was reported at the AERA meeting in April, 1990.

To receive a copy of any of the above papers, send a check for ~~$2.00~~ 4.00/per paper to:

Harvard Graduate School of Education
The National Center for Educational Leadership
443 Gutman Library / 6 Appian Way
Cambridge, MA 02138

Please make checks payable to: **HARVARD UNIVERSITY**

Thank you.

PREPARING SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS FOR THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY: THE REFORM AGENDA

School administration is currently facing vociferous demands for change and improvement (Griffiths, Stout, & Forsyth, 1988). The profession is responding by engaging in the most comprehensive analysis and overhaul of its basic operating structure since the behavioral science revolution of the 1950s and 1960s (National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration, 1987). A number of factors suggest that this current era of turmoil (Griffith, 1979) may lead to fundamental changes in the preparation of school administrators and in the organization and management of schools.

To begin with, unlike previous efforts at administrative reform, the current debate is occurring within the context of a comprehensive agenda for educational improvement -- the educational reform movement of the 1980s (Murphy, in press a). This means that analyses of problems in the profession of school administration, as well as proposed solutions, have come from a much wider array of actors than has been the case in the past. In fact, it is fair to conclude that the educational administration professoriate, the traditional source of reform initiatives, did not contribute significantly to demands for the reform of school administration in the 1980s, especially at the outset (Murphy & Hallinger, 1987).[1] Rather, early voices for reform emanated from two other groups: (1) principals and superintendents engaged in the practice of school administration and (2) critics and researchers who were examining school leadership, not in isolation, but within the

context of the total schooling process.

Members of this latter group in turn tend to fall into one of two camps (Slater, 1988). A number of individuals (e.g. Chubb, 1988) and groups (e.g., Holmes, 1986) view school administrators as a major impediment to achieving effective educational reform:

> Significant gains in student achievement may well require basic changes in the ways schools are governed and organized -- in the authority entrusted to them, the objectives imposed upon them, and the professional discretion they are granted. Such changes would, however, threaten the security of political representatives and education administrators whose positions are tied to the existing system and who now hold the reins of school reform . . . their responsibilities would be radically changed and likely reduced under alternative systems of control, whose enactment they have enough political influence to prevent. The reforms that may be the most promising are, therefore, the ones least likely to be adopted (Chubb, 1988: 28-29).

These reformers generally devise proposals that by-pass current organizational structures, establish new organizational forms to redistribute administrators' authority, and reshape administrator behavior to be congruent with the reformers' perspectives of a professionalized teaching core. The administrative reeducation platform of the Holmes group is representative of these initiatives:

> The existing structure of schools, the current work conditions of teachers, and the current division of authority between administrators and teachers are all seriously out of step with the requirements of the new profession . . . The Holmes group is committed to changing the structure and working conditions within schools to make them compatible with the requirements of a new profession. Member institutions will work toward this end by developing exemplary models for

> new divisions of authority among teachers and administrators in Professional Development Schools and by working within their institutions to make the professional education of administrators compatible with the requirements of the profession of teaching (1986: 67-68).

Policy-makers in the second camp see administrators as important assets, rather than liabilities, in the quest for educational improvement. Instead of attempting to by-pass or neutralize school leaders, these reformers suggest inclusive strategies that place administrators at the center of the reform stage. Language from the National Governors' Association (NGA) and the National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education (NCETE) reflects the spirit of this second line of thought:

> Strong leaders create strong schools. Research and common sense suggest that administrators can do a great deal to advance school reform. They will lead the next wave of reform and states and Governors must act now to help them lead (NGA, 1986: 10). We urge state and local education agencies to recognize that building principals and superintendents, more than any other individuals, are responsible for developing and promoting the environment of the professional growth of teachers and for establishing a collegial environment in which teachers are viewed as partners in efforts to improve instruction (NCATE, 1985: 29).

Because current analyses of school administration emanate from actors in a variety of fields using an assortment of lenses, many of the reform proposals are less insular than were those of the past; they are more integrated with the larger educational and schooling processes -- a central theme of this volume. To be sure, many of the reform initiatives continue to be (not inappropriately) focused on

particular issues of administrative preparation and practice. Others, however, direct our attention to administrative reform within the context of school-based management and professional models of school governance, giving serious consideration to the interrelated nature of reform initiatives.

In addition to receiving input from a wider array of reform analysts and developing proposals that integrate school administration into the larger educational picture, current efforts to improve the profession touch more fundamental issues about the purpose and role of educational leaders than did reform initiatives of the past. They also recognize the radical nature of needed change and suggest strategies for improvement that would have been considered heresy in the not-too-distant past:

> I am thoroughly and completely convinced that, unless a radical reform movement gets underway -- and is successful -- most of us in this room will live to see the end of educational administration as a profession (Griffiths, 1988: 1).

Discussions about continued university control over the content and delivery of both pre-service and post-employment learning opportunities reflect these trends. Fundamental questions about the redistribution of administrative power and influence to teachers and parents have also been raised regularly over the past six years.

For all the reasons noted above, the resolution of issues embedded in the various reform proposals suggests significant revisions in the functions of principals and superintendents. They also presage important alterations in the basic operating

structures of schools and districts. Reform of educational administration in the 1980s also suggests that there will be fundamental changes in programs designed to prepare and provide professional development opportunities for the school administrators who will lead and manage schools in the twenty-first century.

Procedures

As late as 1985, Peterson and Finn were able to report that, "At a time when the nation is deeply concerned about the performance of its schools, and near-to-obsessed with the credentials and careers of those who teach in them, scant attention has been paid to the preparation and qualifications of those who lead them (p. 42)."

In the second wave of school reform reports and studies of the 1980s (1985-1988), much more attention has been directed to issues of school administration and leadership. For example, in their report Results in Education, the National Governors' Association concluded that leadership and management issues are finally receiving, appropriately, attention by state policy makers as new roles for teachers, principals, and superintendents are debated (NGA, 1987: 14).

Yet, to date, no comprehensive analysis of these calls for changes in school administration has been undertaken. The purpose of this paper is to provide such a review -- one that examines reports dealing specifically with educational administration and with studies and reports that consider management and

leadership within the scope of more comprehensive reform suggestions.

The specific goals of this paper are threefold. The first is to explain the reasons for the calls for reform of school administration which have become an important component of the second wave of the current educational reform movement. A comprehensive treatment of the rationale supporting these reform proposals is presented in the first part of the paper. The conceptual framework employed for this first objective was developed by Murphy and Hallinger (1987). Based upon a review of the literature on school improvement, educational leadership, and administrative preparation and professional development, the authors developed a six-part, macro-level framework to explain current demands for specific, micro-level changes in the area of school administration. The first part of the paper provides a review of the perspective previously laid out by Murphy and Hallinger.

The second objective is to review the major studies and reports on educational reform from 1982 to 1988 to uncover their messages for the improvement of school administration. Thirty-two major reports and studies which served as catalysts for the current educational reform movement have been identified and classified, consistent with reports separating 1980s reform activities into two eras (Green, 1987; Hawley, 1988).[2] Reports have been classified as being concerned with the reform of either education in general or school administration in particular. In addition, the major papers written during the 1980s on the reform of school leadership/administration were examined. Document analysis -- coding

and the use of recording matrices -- was used to draw information from the reports and studies. The categories used on the matrices were established by the coding labels and generally corresponded to specific calls for reform, e.g., the recruitment of women and minorities into administration preparation programs and administrative roles.

The third objective, based on the two earlier goals, is to discuss educational administration reform issues that need further attention, e.g., the superintendency and the role of the school district. By casting a wide review net, we are able to shed light upon a number of topics that heretofore have not been fully explored.

Underlying Pressures for Reform

Reform proposals in the area of school administration are buttressed by analyses of current conditions, beliefs about education and the schooling process, and folklore.[3] Collectively, these supporting elements can be classified into four underlying trends that have fueled the proposals for improvement -- both those flowing from reform reports (discussed in the next section) as well as initiatives being undertaken by states, colleges and universities, and school districts (Gousha, Jones, & LoPresti, 1986; Murphy, in press b, 1989; NGA, 1986, 1987; Underwood, 1988 for reviews). In this section we discuss these four trends. Two general conditions and two conditions specific to educational administration are treated (Murphy & Hallinger, 1987; Murphy, in press c).

General Pressures:

The larger reform debate. It was inevitable that the reform lenses being used to examine the general educational problems of the 1980s -- the declining economic competitiveness of the United States and visible indicators of this failing at the school level such as plummeting test scores, poorly educated and unskilled graduates, high student dropout rates[4] -- would focus for a time on the quality of educational leadership and management:

> Although teachers bore the brunt of accountability demands, administrators did not get off scot-free. If students were not achieving enough, teachers must not be teaching well enough, and logically, administrators must not be doing enough either.
>
> Problem assumptions about educational leadership relate primarily to the school productivity decline manifested in falling test scores. As policymakers addressed the problem of declining achievement they first criticized teacher performance then school administration (Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1986: 32, 34).

Once the reform spotlight was directed to the preparation of school administrators and their performance on the job, many of the same problems discovered in the teaching profession surfaced -- lack of standards for entry to all rungs of the professional career ladder, from initial recruitment to preparation programs to selection for job advancement; poor, and perhaps dysfunctional, training; the absence of personal accountability; and so forth. While there are some notable differences in solutions proposed for the problems of teaching and administration,

it is clear that a general pool of concerns about educational quality lends suport to efforts to reform school administration.

Reconceptualization of the appropriate organizational structure-for schools. There is a widespread belief that the most prevalent organizational school structure in the United States -- the bureaucracy -- is an impediment to addressing the most important, difficult, and intransigent problems in our schools. A number of influential analysts have concluded that if substantial educational improvement is to occur, fundamentally different organizational arrangements will be required (American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1988; Clark & Meloy, 1989; Chubb, 1988; National Governors' Association, 1987; Sedlak, Wheeler, Pullin, & Cusick, 1986; Sizer, 1984). Three lines of rationale have converged to push the restructuring debate to the forefront of the educational reform agenda.[5] First, there are analyses of the dysfunctions accompanying bureaucracies (Frymer, 1987; Sizer, 1984: 207-211; also Downs, 1967 for a comprehensive examination). These treatments show how reforms that depend on hierarchical linkages or reinforce existing organizational structures are not only unlikely to succeed, but will probably spawn additional problems (Chubb, 1988; Sedlak, et al., 1986).

Coupled with the anti-bureaucratic rationale are calls for the professionalization of teaching (Carnegie Forum, 1986, 1988; Holmes, 1986; National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education; Wise, 1989). The message in these reports is that real educational reform will occur only when a professional teaching core is created to ensure that they do. The corollary for

restructuring schools has been laid out by the Holmes group (1986: 67): "If the construction of a genuine profession of teaching is to succeed, schools will have to change."

Restructuring proposals also draw support from current decentralization trends in business organizations (Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1986; Kearnes, 1988a, 1988b), and from school effects research (Chubb, 1988; Mortimore, et al., 1988), and school improvement studies that reveal the importance of substantial autonomy for site level staffs (Boyer, 1983; Goodlad, 1984; Sizer, 1984):

> The more control a school has over those aspects of its organization that affect its performance -- the articulation of goals, the selection and management of teachers, the specification of policies -- the more likely it is to exhibit the qualities that have been found to promote effectiveness (Chubb, 1988: 37).

The growing acceptance of the need to alter the basic organizational structure of schools[6] puts tremendous pressure for change on school administration. New forms of governance and control, with concomitant shifts in both the distribution of authority in the system (American Education, 1988; Carnegie Forum, 1986; Holmes, 1986) and the bases for influence (American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1988; Angus, 1988), require new models of leadership (Clark & Meloy, 1989; Liebermen, 1988; National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration, 1987). New perspectives on what leaders do in turn suggest important changes in the preparation of prospective principals and superintendents, and of other women and men to fill many yet to be defined

leadership roles[7] (Rossmiller, 1986).

Pressures Specific to School Administration:

Dissatisfaction with the status quo. With some notable exceptions (Note 1), demands for the reform of school administration are supported by a pervasive sense of the inadequacy of current operations. University programs have come under severe criticism for the way they conduct business and the results they produce (see Clark, 1988; Gerritz, Koppich, & Guthrie, 1984; Murphy & Hallinger, 1987; Peterson & Finn, 1985 for reviews). The most encompassing critique maintains that current preparation programs are dysfunctional. According to this line of analysis, in their quest to gain respectability in the wider university community, programs were molded to fit an arts and sciences rather than a professional model of preparation. The behavioral sciences in turn became the structure and deductive theory the heart of the new model (Boyan, 1981; Culbertson, 1981; Miklos, 1983).

Over the last decade, researchers have pointed out how social science frameworks have failed to deliver on their promise to yield powerful understandings of the business of school administration (Campbell, 1981; Carver, 1988; Cooper & Boyd, 1987; Crowson & McPherson, 1987). Others have shown how the arts and sciences model has contributed to the use of processes and procedures that conflict with those emphasized on the job (Bridges, 1977; Mann, 1975; Peterson & Finn, 1985; Pitner, 1982). Still others have revealed how the profession, driven by the

"behavioral science theory engine" (Carver, 1988: 1), has directed administrative attention away from the study of technical core operations and issues of educational productivity and toward issues of management (Boyd, 1983; Erickson, 1977; Murphy & Hallinger, 1987). Finally, and most seriously, analysts have documented the failure of the theory movement to produce real improvements in the practice of school administration and the functioning of school organizations (Blumberg, 1984; Bridges, 1982; Goldhammer, 1983; Griffiths, 1988).

Lessons from successful schools. The dissatisfaction with the status quo in the profession is accompanied by reform pressure of a more positive sort -- a growing body of research showing that school administrators can have an important influence on organizational outcomes, especially on measures of student performance.[8] At the same time that deficiencies in preparation programs are being uncovered, studies are confirming the connection between school administrators, especially principals, and effective schools:

> "For years now, studies have been pointing to the pivotal role of the principal in bringing about more effective schools. Our own field studies bear out these findings. In schools where achievement was high and where there was a clear sense of community, we found, invariably, that the principal made the difference (Boyer, 1983: 219)."

Researchers are discovering that the women and men referred to by Boyer and others act differently than their counterparts in average schools (Murphy, 1988b for a review). Because of this, there is growing pressure to change university preparation programs and to create alternative systems to produce school

administrators who are prepared to function more like the administrators of these effective schools -- and less like social scientists (Murphy & Hallinger, 1987).

Reform Report Messages About Needed Changes

Not surprisingly, there are some differences among the various reform reports concerning the appropriate nature of school administration reform. At the same time, however, there are important consistencies in philosophical foundations and actual initiatives in the reports. We discuss these commonalities below under the headings of leadership, professionalism, and standards.

Leadership:

> What is all important is that the principal provide the educational leadership that the school community needs. It has been shown in repeated studies that the quality of teaching and learning that goes on in a school is largely determined by the quality of such leadership (Adler, 1982: 64).

Leadership is the coin of the realm in reform reports that touch upon school administration. Of the 32 documents examined for this paper, two-thirds proposed improving schools by strengthening management or leadership skills, or both.[9] Of these 21, 17 dealt overwhelmingly with the leadership dimension of administration, 2 focused primarly on management skills, and 2 others gave roughly equally emphasis to each of the topics. The following statements from the reports illustrate this concern with leadership:

> The Commission stresses the distinction between leadership skills involving persuasion, setting goals and developing community consensus behind them, and managerial and supervising skills. Although the latter are necessary, we believe that school boards must consciously develop leadership skills at the school and district levels if the reforms we propose are to be achieved. (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983: 32)

> We urge that administrative training programs in higher education be examined and modified to provide for explicit educational leadership skills in existing and potential administrators. We further urge local education agencies to recognize that building principals will have to delegate some managerial duties in order to assume the leadership role we propose. Building principals may need additional personnel to assist in managing their schools so that they have time to provide educational leadership. (National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education, 1985: 39)

> These things being so, the head of the school -- its administrator -- should not be solely or even primarily concerned with running the school efficiently or economically, or merely keeping the peace of the community. Keeping the peace, doing justice, balancing budgets, enforcing laws is the main business of the political community at any level; they are not the main business of the school community. Its main business is teaching and learning. The head of the school -- its principal -- should, therefore, administer all other affairs in ways that facilitate the main business (Adler, 1982: 63-64).

> School administrators risk becoming an anachronism if their preparation programs in schools, colleges, and departments of education do not respond to calls for change in preparing them for the professional leadership functions (American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1988: 1).

There is also a significant overlap in the reports about the direction and focus of

leadership.

Direction. Reform of school administration in the 1980s has been synonymous with reform of the principalship. Sixteen of the 20 relevant reports deal almost exclusively with this role; the other 4 treat administrators in general. Studies and reports are overwhelmingly concerned with increasing the leadership capacity of current and prospective site-level administrators. Remarkably little attention has been given to either superintendents specifically or district level operations in general. Two factors help explain this preoccupation with the principalship. First, it is a logical extension of the priority being given to decentralized governance and leadership in schools. This focus in turn emanates from the recent emphasis on decentralized management in the private sector and the widespread lobbying for a school-by-school improvement model in education (Boyer, 1983; Goodlad, 1984; Sizer, 1984). Second, there has been a historical neglect of the superintendency as an area of analysis (Bridges, 1982). It is not surprising, therefore, that when reformers in the 1980s have looked toward improving school leadership their focus has been elsewhere than on the central office.

Calls for strengthening leadership tend to direct administrative attention toward internal school operations rather than toward the management of school-environmental interactions, a pattern that is consistent with reform proposals in other areas as well (Sedlak, et al., 1986). Eleven of the 17 relevant reports have a primarily internal focus, 5 have a mixed internal - external focus, and 1

directs principals' attention to issues external to the school. There thus appears to be a clear shift away from the predominate concern devoted to environmental issues that accompanied adoption of the behavioral science model of administrator preparation in the 1960s. This last major era of administrative reform opened the eyes of school leaders to the wider world in which their schools operated. The current era of reform is refocusing attention on internal school operations, especially on the teaching-learning process.

Instructional focus. Consistent with the redirection of attention toward internal operations, reform proposals have exhorted administrators to develop a better understanding of the core technology of education:

> Without a thorough grounding in the realities of the classroom, principals will continue to feel uncomfortable and inadequate in educational leadership roles. Moreover, they will continue to lack credibility in instructional matters with their teachers (Boyer, 1983: 223).
>
> The challenge now is to . . . match state-sponsored educational training and certification requirements to the skills principals need to be effective (National Governors' Association, 1986: 11).

These proposals also urge administrators to devote more time, energy, and authority to the central mission of schooling:

> What of the school principal? He or she is the principal teacher. Schools need business management, and there should be executives for this. But the principal is the lead teacher and needs to be among colleagues and students, as that is where the most vital judgments in the life of a school must be made (Sizer, 1984: 198)."
>
> Schools need instructional leadership, but at present the

> principal's time is largely consumed by management tasks. Currently, most principals, for example, are trained as managers, but are not prepared to meet school instructional leadership needs. Leadership education should include much more emphasis upon the study of curriculum and instruction, learning, teaching, evaluation, assessment (American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1988: 3, 5, 11).

> We recommend that the school principal in each school be acknowledged as the school's leader and as the manager of its instructional program. The principal should be freed from distractions; encouraged to give priority to improving classroom instruction; . . . This means that in many places, the prevailing definition of the principal's role must be changed to put the principal squarely in charge of educational quality in each school. (Educational Commission of the States, 1983: 40)

And, finally, reformers call upon administrators to use the expertise they acquire as the basis for leading the school community:

> The status and authority of school administrators will shift. Their authority will derive more directly from their expertise in the core functions of schooling than from hierarchical positions in the school bureaucracy (American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1988: 1).

The failure of departments of educational administration to provide prospective leaders with technical competencies in curriculum and instruction and of districts to expect or encourage expertise in these areas, with the not surprising absence of administrative attention to technical core issues, has been documented elsewhere -- as have the fundamental causes for this state of affairs (Murphy, 1988a; Murphy & Hallinger, 1987; Murphy, Hallinger, Lotto, & Miller, 1987).

Here it is sufficient to show the prevalence of reform proposals in this area and to note the magnitude of the change embedded in these suggestions. Keeping in mind that there are certain rather serious flaws in study designs used to measure the instructional leadership activities of administrators (Murphy, 1988a for a review), the cumulative results from this line of investigation reveal that, before the onslaught of the reform proposals of the 1980s, principals were spending between 5 and 20 percent of their time managing technical core operations and superintendents were devoting even less time to curriculum and instruction matters (Murphy, 1988b for a review). These facts led researchers like Hannaway and Sproull 1978-79: 4) to conclude that "the technical tasks associated with producing student learning are not supervised, managed or coordinated in any serious sense across managerial levels in school districts." If the reform proposals of the 1980s are influential in shaping preparation programs and administrative behavior, there should be a dramatic shift in the attention administrators devote to the core technology of schooling in the years ahead.

Professionalism:

> Administrator preparation programs should be like those in professional schools which emphasize theoretical and clinical knowledge, applied research, and supervised practice. (National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration, 1987: 20)

The professionalization of school administration is a second major theme in relevant reform reports. While a similar theme characterizes proposals to improve

teaching, there are important differences between the two areas in the strategies employed to promote professionalism. The professionalization of teaching focuses on standards, working conditions, salaries, autonomy, and involvement in school decisions (Carnegie, 1986, 1988; Green, 1987). With the exception of standards and autonomy, these strategies for enhancing the status of teachers are not major components of the reform literature for school leadership. Rather, methods to strengthen the profession of school administration have focused primarily on two interrelated issues -- the development of a professional knowledge base and the use of a program delivery system consistent with those used in other professional schools, rather than with those in university graduate schools.

Establishment of a professional knowledge base. As we noted earlier, the last wave of reform in school administration introduced the behavioral sciences to preparation programs for educational leaders. The frameworks from the various social science disciplines in turn became the knowledge base and deductive theory the method of inquiry emphasized in these programs. Lessons from practice were displaced as "cookbook recipes" which were incompatible with the scientific perspective and intellectual rigor of this new context for training. The behavioral science frameworks, although readily accepted by university departments of educational administration, never generated much enthusiasm in the field (Goldhammer, 1983; National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1985). Neither did they live up to the expectation that they would lead to meaningful improvements in administrative practice[10] (Blumberg, 1984; Campbell, 1981; Carver,

1988; Culbertson, 1981; Erlandson, 1979; Griffiths, 1988):

> The dual nature of educational administration programs since their inception -- academic and professional --has, in reality, occasioned an emphasis on academic content and instruction. This academic emphasis has high legitimacy with institutions of higher education and represents a major environmental press for departments of educational administration. Recently, however, demands have increased for greater correspondence between the content and structure of program offerings and the changing need of those who practice in the field (National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1985:4).

> The once-glowing promise of a Theory Movement in educational administration -- rooted in the academic disciplines and the scientific method, bringing theory-based research to the improvement of practice, striving mightily to develop a profession well grounded in reliable and affirmed knowledge -- seems to have been unfulfilled (Crowson & McPherson, 1987: 46).

At the same time that growing discontent with the behavioral science model was surfacing, practitioners and professors alike were seeking powerful new frames of knowledge that would lead to a unification of the practice and delivery arms of the profession and to real improvements in the management and organization of schools. The focus of both groups has come to rest on the type of knowledge base that underlies other professions such as law and medicine:

> In order to accomplish <u>their</u> charter, however, schools of education must take the profession of education, not academia, as their main point of reference. It is not sufficient to say that the greatest strength of schools of education is that they are the only places to look at fundamental issues from a variety of disciplinary perspectives. They have been doing so for more than half a century without appreciable effect on professional practice. It is time for many institutions to shift their gears (Clifford & Guthrie, 1988: 32; American

Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1988:11).

The new knowledge base proposed by many current reformers is different from the behavioral science frameworks in a number of ways. Most importantly, since it emphasizes the use of inductive methods of knowledge development, it reflects the realities of the workplace much more accurately than have the social science frameworks. As noted earlier, it is grounded on internal school operations and technical core issues, thus reversing previous preoccupation with environmental issues and the management aspects of administrative roles. This as yet inchoate professional framework also flows more from information about administrator effects on organizational outcomes, especially on student learning, than has been the case in the past. Finally, because its understanding of school administration emanates more directly from the study of practice, skill-based knowledge has been relegitimated.

Professional model of delivery. Reformers in the area of school administration have become disgruntled with current preparation programs that are: (1) often little more than collections of diverse and poorly integrated classes lacking clear focus and purpose (Achilles, 1984; Cooper & Boyd, 1987; National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1985; United States Department of Education, 1988); (2) delivered to prospective administrators with little regard for sequence or thought about continuums of skills and knowledge (Peterson & Finn, 1985; Pitner, 1982); and (3) provided to students at times and through instructional approaches that are least conducive to learning (American Association of Colleges

for Teacher Education, 1988; Erlandson & Witters-Churchill, 1988; Nunnery, 1982; United States Department of Education, 1988). In seeking a more appropriate system to deliver the new knowledge base that they envision, reformers have again turned toward professional schools for examples:

> Schools of education, and particularly departments of educational administration, must turn back to the schools and establish relationships such as exist between professional schools in the university and their practitioners. We should be proud to become the professional backbone of the schools. Schools of education must become full-fledged professional schools, not pseudo arts and science colleges . . . Once we accept the idea that schools of education must become professional schools granting professional degrees, we can get squared away on the job of preparing professional school administrators (Griffiths, 1988: 10).

The model explicated by reformers clearly separates the Ph.D. (research) and the Ed.D. (professional) degrees[11] (Clifford & Guthrie, 1988; Griffiths, 1988; Miskel, 1988). The latter program is designed to "differ from that of researchers because it must emphasize the application of knowledge and skills in clinical rather than academic situations" (National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration, 1987: 19). A further objective of the new model is the codification of knowledge into a sequential body of understandings and skills (National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration, 1987). Educational administration students would progress through these continuums like students in other professions; that is, in the proper sequence, in cohorts, and in full-time study (Clark, 1988; Griffiths, 1988). Instructional approaches emphasized in other professional schools would become integral components of the delivery model

(American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1988; Cooper & Boyd, 1987; Hoyle, 1987; National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1985). In addition, the professional delivery model offers hope for overcoming two of the most intransigent problems in educational administration -- the absence of robust clinical preparation (Daresh, 1987; Erlandson, 1979; Pepper, 1988) and the lack of integration between the training and delivery arms (Carver, 1988; Goldhammer, 1983; National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration, 1987).

Standards:

> Continuing public concern about standards for both students and professional personnel is reflected in state efforts to raise standards for administrators, especially principals (National Governors' Association, 1987:14).
>
> Entry into administration should indicate more than perserverance and time served. It should indicate that some of our best, most well-prepared, and most creative people have entered the field, not the bottom of the barrel (Cooper & Boyd, 1987: 20).

A third theme that colors almost every aspect of administrative reform is the need to raise standards. From recruitment of students, to program quality, to the selection of men and women for administrative positions, the profession's standards have been found to be wanting.

Recruitment. Reform reports that address the recruitment and selection procedures used by educational administration programs have found them to be absent, pro forma, or ineffective (American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1988; National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration,

1987). Processes are often informal, haphazard, and casual (Clark, 1988; Cooper & Boyd, 1987; Gerritz, Koppich, & Guthrie, 1984; Goodlad, 1984). Because leader recruitment programs are often lacking (American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1988; Miskel, 1988), prospective administrators are often self-selected (Achilles, 1984; Clark, 1988; National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration, 1987). Few efforts are made to attract women and minorities (American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1988). "Entrance requirements are not competitive and programs are easy to enter and complete" (American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, 1988: 6; Gerritz, Koppich, & Guthrie, 1984). The results of low standards for recruitment and selection have been amply documented: prospective administrators are often of below average ability compared to their peers in other graduate school departments (Griffiths, 1988; Rossmiller, 1986); reduced standards in other phases of preparation programs (Cooper & Boyd, 1987); men and women who are politically conservative and adverse to risk-taking and personal accountability (Achilles, 1984; United States Department of Education, 1988); and a lack of minorities in administrative roles at every level of the profession (Griffiths, 1988).

Preparation program content. Poor marks on standards have been awarded on numerous dimensions of administrative preparation programs. For example, reports by the National Association of Secondary School Principals (1985) and the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (1987) point to outdated content, lack of sequenced coursework, and the absence of meaningful

clinical experiences. Clark (1988) concluded that course content, in addition to being outdated, is often banal. The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (1988) noted that there is much redundancy in coursework. Overall assessments of the quality of preparation programs are not flattering. The California Commission on the Teaching Profession (cited in United States Department of Education, 1988) labeled training for the administrative credential as "hopelessly inadequate"; Peterson and Finn (1985: 29) reported that many graduates consider their programs "to have been easy, boring and only intermittently useful to them in their work" (Boyer, 1983; Gerritz, Koppich, & Guthrie, 1984).

Preparation program structure. The below-standard content in many preparation programs is reinforced by a delivery structure -- part-time, evening coursework -- that promotes low expectations on the part of professors and students. Clark (1988: 4) has made explicit what others have feared to verbalize: "we have given up holding tired, end-of-the day students to graduate level performance." This self-reinforcing cycle of diminished expectations often leads professors to ask less and less of students, and students to become more and more cynical about their university preparation for administrative jobs (Cooper & Boyd, 1987; Miskel, 1988; Murphy, 1988c; Peterson & Finn, 1985). Compounding this problem is a professoriate in educational administration that: (1) is unwilling or unable to improve the delivery structure (and content) (Hawley, 1988a; McCarthy, 1987); and (2) has bargained away expectations and standards in exchange for high enrollments and compliant student behavior (Mann, 1975).[12]

Monitoring progress. It is probably not surprising that programs which are easy to enter and which do not require much of students should also have low standards in the area of monitoring student progress. Assessments of student progress at key junctures in their programs are either absent or conducted in a perfunctory fashion. Meaningful competency tests on needed skills are conspicuous by their absence in most preparation programs. "Too many [programs] have exit requirements that are slack and unrelated to the workplace of the profession" (Peterson & Finn, 1985: 54). A standards-free, non-judgmental attitude pervades many departments of school administration (Peterson & Finn, 1985). The assumption is that rigorous and appropriate standards will be applied at later stages in the process of moving toward administrative employment -- especially at the dissertation, certification, and job-selection steps. Unfortunately, this assumption is inaccurate (Baltzell & Dentler, 1983; National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration, 1987).

Certification standards. In many states, certification "is little more than a pro forma requirement" (United States Department of Education, 1987: 17) and it does not provide rigorous standards for the licensure of prospective administrators (Peterson & Finn, 1985). The National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (1987: 25) concluded that "it is difficult to think of another profession in which [certification] screening is so poorly executed."

Employment standards. A number of the major reform reports have reported that the standards employed to screen job applicants are no higher than

those used in the major steps leading to this activity. Boyer (1983: 221) labeled the selection process as "quixotic" and subject to a cloudy "set of local and custom-bound criteria." Goodlad (1984: 306) noted that the selection process "is, to say the least, casual." The most damaging assessment of standards employed in the selection of school leaders was provided by Baltzell and Dentler (1983) in a study conducted for the National Institute of Education. Specifically, they found that neither educational leadership, merit, nor equity criteria characterized the selection process. Rather, they reported that candidates were held to standards of fit with local values and image.

Standards of professional development for practicing school administrators. Reform reports suggest that the quality of programs for the professional development of practicing school administrators leaves much to be desired (Daresh & LaPlant, 1984 for a review of problems). As we have reported elsewhere (Murphy, in press b), this area has been the subject of more reform initiatives during the 1980s than any other topic in school administration. The lack of time to study (Boyer, 1983), the absence of systematic professional development opportunities (National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration, 1987), and the need for greater district support (Goodlad, 1984) and enhanced incentives (American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1988) have all been noted.

Conclusion

In this paper we have outlined the scope and nature of calls for reform in school administration in the 1980s. We began by examining forces that have acted as catalysts in raising problems to the surface and that have sustained reform efforts. We reported how the larger reform debate has helped to illuminate school administration issues and helped spawn leadership improvement proposals that are more tightly integrated with other important areas of education than was the case in the past. We revealed how the reexamination of the appropriate operating structures for schools has raised fundamental questions about leadership and management in those organizations. We also saw how factors endemic to educational administration were contributing to the school leadership reform agenda. Specifically, we examined the role that the widespread dissatisfaction with the status quo in school administration -- especially the estrangement between the training and delivery arms of the profession -- has played in the debate about needed changes. We developed the link between reform initiatives and lessons from successful schools, especially in terms of ideas for how administrators should work with the teaching core and how they should spend their time.

Next we turned our attention to the major reform reports and studies of the 1980s to see what suggestions they contained for improvement of the profession. Three major themes were uncovered. We saw how calls for more and better leadership have dominated the reform literature. We reported that there is much

consistency in suggestions that administrators, particularly principals, turn more of their attention to the internal workings of their schools, especially to the central mission of teaching and learning. The second major reform theme, the professionalization of school administration, was distilled from calls to reshape preparation programs in the mold of other professional schools -- through both the development of a knowledge base grounded in the practice of school administration and the establishment of a professional school model of delivery. We noted how the unification of the academic and field components of the profession is a central tenet of this second theme. Finally, we viewed an array of issues that illustrated the third theme of the reform proposals -- the establishment of more rigorous standards at every phase of the profession, from recruitment of students into preparation programs to the selection of graduates for employment.

On the surface, the reforms being proposed -- raising the intellectual and educational capital in the profession and moving toward practice-driven models of knowledge development and delivery -- offer much promise for improving not only educational administration but the whole of schooling as well. Yet, as with most treatments of educational issues, the easiest job is the analysis of problems; second-order work, like plotting appropriate directions for improvements based on these analyses, is more difficult. And completing the activities to ensure that the new visions are realized will be exceedingly difficult business indeed. The Theory Movement produced so little, compared with expectations, not because of inappropriate specification of problems (e.g., the naked empiricism of the 1940s and

1950s), nor because the direction it charted was flawed. It failed to reach its potential because the difficult day-in-and-day-out work of developing and translating theory was not done well enough by sufficient numbers of professionals. The same fate may lie in store for the Professional Movement if a large enough number of professors and practitioners do not carry forward with the sometimes tedious, sometimes exhilarating work that lies ahead.

Let me close with a note about possible expansions of the themes in this new Professional Movement in school administration -- two next steps once the Professional Movement gets its feet on the ground. The first is to bring educational administration programs and views of school leaders in line with thinking from the emerging third wave of educational reform in the 1980s. Scholars like Michael Kirst (1987) at Stanford and Willis Hawley at Vanderbilt (1988b) have pointed to the need to expand reform beyond standards (wave one and the restructuring of schools (wave two). They have called for a child-centered reform agenda (wave three). I believe that this agenda provides a robust framework to develop, organize, and unpack the appropriate content to be employed in professional schools of education generally and in departments of educational administration specifically. It is a framework that is consistent with the philosophy and illustrative of the content of this volume.

A second expansion is drawn from the work of Luvern Cunningham (1988) at Ohio State. Cunningham and his colleagues are engaged in efforts to apply inter-professional lenses (as opposed to the inter-disciplinary frames from the

Theory Movement) to the solution of important problems in education. This approach, especially in conjunction with a child-centered educational agenda, offers much hope for enhancing the profession of school administration and the wisdom of the men and women who lead and manage our schools.

NOTES

1. While the reasons for this are complex, McCarthy (1987) has shown that most professors were quite pleased with the status quo in the area of administrative preparation. Thus, at least in the early part of the 1980's, the professoriate lacked a basic condition necessary for change to occur, a dissatisfaction with the current state of affairs. This level of satisfaction was not shared either by practitioners in school administration (Boyer, 1983; Peterson & Finn, 1985) nor professionals in other education fields (Chubb, 1988). This is not to imply that no voices for change were heard within the professorial ranks. The work of Nunnery (1982) in particular presaged critique from the general educational community and later analysis from professors of educational administration. See also Bridges (1977, 1982), Erickson (1977), and Mann (1975).

2. The designation of a reform report as "wave 1" or "wave 2" has more to do with the fabric of the suggestions than with the date of publication. However, given this caveat, there is a very strong correlation between publication data of the major reform reports and the underlying principles and content of their recommendations (see Murphy (in press a) for a treatment of the basic principles of each wave of educational reform in the 1980s).

3. On the mythical bases of educational reform proposals, see Hawley (1985, 1988).

4. Many of the reform reports document this decline in the American economy, connect it to poor measures of educational productivity, and trace causes to school and classroom level structures, policies, and activities (Murphy, in press a). See especially The Carnegie Forum (1986) and the National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983); also Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (1986); Boyd & Hartman (in press); Business Education (1988); Clinton (1987); Chubb (1988); Kearnes (1988a, 1988b); Peterson (1988).

5. The national conference on restructuring schooling held at Trinity University in San Antonio, Texas in August 1987 is an example of focused attention around the topic of restructuring school organizations. The product of that conference, Schooling for Tomorrow, edited by Sergiovanni and Moore (1989) is a good compendium of issues on redesigning school organizations.

6. See Firestone and Wilson (1985) for an empirical investigations of bureaucratic and professional schools, administrative behavior, and student achievement.

7. Two of these potential new roles -- head teachers for individual schools, and headmistresses or headmasters for a senior high school and its feeder schools -- have been described by Goodlad (1984: 302-306). In addition, growing acceptance of: (1) school-based management teams and building leadership teams (Brookover, et al., 1982; Caldwell & Spinks, 1988; Duttweiler & Hord, 1987; Glatthorn & Newberg, 1984); (2) notions of leadership density

(Sergiovanni, 1989) and leadership as functions rather than roles (Gersten & Carnine, 1981; Murphy, 1988a); and (3) organizational substitutes for leadership functions (Pitner, 1986) have important implications for training programs and professional development experiences in school administration.

8. Support for this finding comes from the following lines of investigation: school effects, school improvement, effective principals, staff development, and school change. See Murphy (1988a, 1988b) for reviews.

9. We do not find this dichotomy between management and leadership to be particularly helpful or accurate. Elsewhere we have argued that it is impossible to separate these activities (Murphy, Hallinger, & Mitman, 1983). The important issues are the foci of activities performed -- whether they promote the teaching-learning process, the purposes with which actions are empowered, and the perceptions of those whom the behaviors are designed to impact (Murphy, 1988a).

10. For a rich treatment of the contributions that the theory movement has made to educational administration, see Crowson and McPherson (1987).

11. At present the two degrees are virtually indistinguishable (Norton & Levan, 1987) and neither focuses on preparing students for the practice of administration (Miskel, 1988).

12. Mann (1975) has provided the most complete treatment of bargains and treaties between professors and students of educational administration. Few others have explicitly addressed the issue. Cusick (1983), Murphy (1988b)

and his colleagues (1987), and Sedlak, et. al. (1986) touch upontreaties between practicing administrators and teachers. Most of the work on lowering standards through bargains has been done by researchers examining teacher-student relationships. See Oakes (1985), Page (1984), Powell, Farrar & Cohen (1985), Sedlak et. al. (1986), and Sizer (1984) for an examination of these accommodations, treaties, compromises, and bargains.

APPENDIX A: Reform Reports and Studies Analyzed

WAVE 1 of SCHOOL REFORM

A. General Reform Reports (January 1983-October 1985)

1.	A Nation at Risk	National Commission on Excellence in Education	1983
2.	Academic Preparation for College: What Students Need to Know and be Able to Do	The College Board	1983
3.	Educating Americans for the 21st Century	National Science Board Commission	1983
4.	Action for Excellence	Education Commission of the States	1983
5.	A Call for Change in Teacher Education	National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education	1985

B. Educational Administration Specific Reform Report (January 1983-October 1985)

6.	Selecting American School Principals	National Institute of Education (D.C. Baltzell & R. A. Dentler)	1983

C. Educational Studies (1982-1984)

7.	The Paideia Proposal	Mortimer Adler	1982
8.	High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America	Carnegie Foundation (Ernest Boyer)	1983
9.	Action in the States	Education Commission of the States	1984
10.	A Place Called School	John Goodlad	1984
11.	Horace's Compromise: The Dilemma of the American High School	Theodore Sizer	1984

WAVE 2 of SCHOOL REFORM

A. General Reform Reports (November 1985-December 1988)

12.	Tomorrow's Teachers: A Report of the Holmes Group	Holmes Group	1986
13.	School Boards: Strengthening Grass Roots Leadership	Institute for Educational Leadership	1986
14.	What Works: Research About Teaching and Learning	U.S. Department of Education	1986
15.	Time for Results: The Governors' 1991 Report on Education	National Governors' Association	1986
16.	First Lessons: A Report on Elementary Education in America	U.S. Department of Education (William J. Bennett)	1986
17.	A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century	Carnegie Forum	1986
18.	School Reform Policy: A Call for Reason	Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development	1986
19.	American Education: Making it Work	U.S. Department of Education	1988

B. Educational Administration Specific Reform Reports (November 1985-December 1988)

20.	Performance-Based Preparation of Principals	National Association of Secondary School Principals	1985
21.	Principal Selection Guide: A Framework for Improvement	U.S. Department of Education/ Office of Educational Research and Improvement	1987
22.	Leaders for America's Schools	National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration	1987

23.	Speaking for Leadership	Education Commission of the States (Bill Clinton)	1987
24.	School Leadership Preparation: A Preface for Action	American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education	1988

C. Educational Studies (1985-1988)

25.	The Shopping Mall High School: Winners and Losers in the Educational Marketplace	A. Powell, E. Farrar & D. Cohen	1985
26.	Keeping Track: How Schools Structure Inequality	Jeannie Oakes	1985
27.	The Last Citadel: American High Schools Since 1940	Robert Hampel	1986
28.	Selling Students Short: Classroom Bargains and Academic Reform in the American High School	Michael Sedlak et. al.	1986
29.	Results in Education: The Governors' 1991 Report on Education, 1987	National Governors' Association	1987
30.	Report Card on School Reform	Carnegie Foundation (Ernest Boyer)	1988
31.	Schools Matter: The Junior Years	Peter Mortimore et. al.	1988
32.	What Price Democracy? Politics, Markets and American Schools	John Chubb & Terry Moe	1988

References

Achilles, C. M. (1984, Fall). Forecast: Stormy weather ahead in educational administration. Issues in Education, 2(2), 127-135.

Adler, M. J. (1982). The Paideia proposal. New York: McMillan.

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (1988). School leadership preparation: A preface for action. Washington, D.C.: Author.

Angus, L. (1988, April). School leadership and educational reform. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. (1986, September). School reform policy: A call for reason. Alexandria, VA: Author.

Baltzell, D. C., & Dentler, R. A. (1983, January). Selecting American school principals: A sourcebook for educators. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Education/National Institute of Education.

Bennett, W. J. (1986). First lessons: A report on elementary education in America. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Education.

Blumberg, A. (1984, Fall). The craft of school administration and some other rambling thoughts. Educational Administration Quarterly, 20(4), 24-40.

Boyan, N. J. (1981, February). Follow the leader: Commentary on research in educational administration. Educational Research, 10(2), 6-13, 21.

Boyd, W. L. (1983, March). What school administrators do and don't do: Implications for effective schools. The Canadian Administrator, 22(6), 1-4.

Boyd, W. L., & Hartman, W. T. (in press). The politics of educational productivity. In D. Monk & J. Underwood (Eds.), Distributing educational resources within nations, states, school districts, and schools. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

Boyer, E. L. (1983). High school: A report on secondary education in America. New York: Harper and Row.

Bridges, E. M. (1977). The nature of leadership. In L. L. Cunningham, W. Hack, & R. O. Nystrand (Eds.), Educational administration: The developing decades. Berkeley: McCutchan.

Bridges, E. M. (1982, Summer). Research on the school administrator: The state of the art, 1967-1980. Educational

Brookover, W., Beamer, L., Efthim, H., Hathaway, D., Lezotte, L., Miller, S., Passalacqua, J., & Tornatzhy, L. (1982). Creating effective schools: An in-service program for enhancing school learning climate and achievement. Holmes Beach, FL: Learning Publications.

Business Education Partnership Committee and the Committee for Financing Excellence in Education. (1988). An evaluation of the educational progress from South Carolina's educational improvement efforts: The fourth annual report on the South Carolina education improvement act. Columbia, S.C.: Author.

Caldwell, B. J., & Spinks, J. M. (1988). The self-managing school. New York: Falmer Press.

Campbell, R. F. (1981, Winter). The professorship in educational administration: A personal view. Educational Administration Quarterly, 17(1), 124.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (1986, May). A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century. Washington, D.C.: Author.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1988). Report card on school reform: The teachers speak. Princeton, N.J.: Author.

Carver, F. D. (1988, June). The evaluation of the study of educational administration. Paper presented at the EAAA Allerton House Conference, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Chubb, J. E. (1988, Winter). Why the current wave of school reform will fail. The Public Interest, (90), 28-49.

Chubb, J. E., & Moe, T. M. (1988). What price democracy? Politics, markets, and American schools. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution.

Clark, D. L. (1988). Charge to the study group of the National Policy Board of Educational Administration. Unpublished manuscript.

Clark, D. L., & Meloy, J. M. (1989). Renouncing bureaucracy: A democratic structure for leadership in schools. In T. J. Sergiovanni and J. H. Moore (Eds.), Schooling for tomorrow: Directing reforms to issues that count. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Clifford, G. J., & Guthrie, J. W. (1988, June 8). Strategies for reforming schools of education. Education Week, 7(31), 32, 23.

Clinton, B. (1987, July). Speaking of leadership. Denver: Educational Commission of the States.

The College Board (1983). Academic preparation for college. New York: Author.

Cooper, B. S., & Boyd, W. L. (1987). The evolution of training for school administrators. In J. Murphy & P. Hallinger (Eds.), Approaches to administrative training. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Crowson, R. L., & McPherson, R. B. (1987). The legacy of the theory movement: Learning from the new tradition. In J. Murphy & P. Hallinger (Eds.), Approaches to administrative training. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Culberton, J. A. (1981, Winter). Antecedents of the theory movement. Educational Administration Quarterly, 17(1), 25-47.

Cusick, P. (1983). The egalitarian ideal and the American high school. New York: Longman.

Cunningham, L. L. (October, 1988). Discussant remarks made at the annual meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Cincinnati.

Daresh, J. C. (1987, February). The practicum in preparing educational administrators: A status report. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Educational Research Association, Boston.

Daresh, J. C., & LaPlant, J. C. (1984, April). Inservice for school administrators: A status report. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

Downs, A. (1967). Inside bureaucracy. Boston: Little & Brown.

Duttweiler, P., & Hord, S. (1988). Dimensions of effective leadership. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

Educational Commission of the States (1983). Action for excellence. Denver: Author.

Erickson, D. A. (1977). An overdue paradigm shift in educational administration, or how can we get that idiot off the freeway? In L. L. Cunningham, W. G. Hack, & R. O. Nystrand (Eds.), Educational administration: The developing decades. Berkeley: McCuthan.

Erlandson, D. A. (1979, Fall). Language, experience, and administrator preparation. Planning and Changing, 10(3),

Erlandson, D. A., & Witters-Churchill, L. (1988, March). The Texas NASSP study. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Firestone, W. A. & Wilson, B. L. (1985, July). Management and organizational outcomes: The effects of approach and environment in schools. Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools, Inc.

Frymier, J. (1987, September). Bureaucracy and the neutering of teachers. Phi Delta Kappan, 69(1), 9-14.

Gerritz, W., Koppich, J., & Guthrie, J. (1984, November). Preparing California school leaders: An analysis of supply, demand, and training. Berkeley, CA: Policy Analysis for California Educators, University of California, Berkeley.

Gersten, R., & Carnine, D. (1981, September). Administrative and supervisory support functions for the implementation of effective educational programs for low income students. Eugene: University of Oregon, Center for Educational Policy and Management.

Glatthorn, A. A., & Newberg, N. A. (1984, February). A team approach to instructional leadership. Educational Leadership, 41(5), 60-63.

Goldhammer, K. (1983, Summer). Evolution in the profession. Educational Administration Quarterly, 19(3), 249-272.

Goodlad, J. I. (1984). A place called school: Prospects for the future. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Gousha, R. P., Jones, A. H., & LoPresti, P. L. (1986, March). Where are we and where are we going in school administration preparation in the United States? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Green, J. (1987). The next wave: A synopsis of recent education reform reports. Denver: Educational Commission of the States.

Griffiths, D. E. (1979, Fall). Intellectual turmoil in educational administration. Educational Administration Quarterly, 15(3), 43-65.

Griffiths, D. E. (1988). Educational administration: Reform PDQ or RIP. Tempe, AZ: University Council for Educational Administration. (Occasional paper: #8312).

Griffiths, D. E., Stout, R. T., & Forsyth, P. B. (Eds.) (1988). Leaders for America's schools. Berkeley: McCutchan.

Hampel, R. (1986). The last little citadel: American high schools since 1940. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Hawley, W. D. (1985, Summer). False premises and false promises: The mythical character of public discourse about education. The Peabody Reflector, 58(1), 2-4.

Hawley, W. D. (1988a). "Universities and improvement of school management." In D. E. Griffiths, R. T. Stout, & P. B. Forsyth (Eds.), Leaders for America's Schools. Berkeley: McCutchan.

Hawley, W. D. (1988b, November). Missing pieces of the educational reform agenda: Or why the first and second waves may miss the boat. Educational Administration Quarterly, 24(4), 416-437.

Holmes Group (1986, April). Tomorrow's Teachers. USA: Author.

Howell, B. (1981, January). Profile of the principalship. Educational Leadership, 38(4), 333-336.

Hoyle, J. (1987). The AASA model for preparing school leaders. In J. Murphy & P. Hallinger (Eds.), Approaches to administrative training. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Institute for Educational Leadership (1986). School boards: Strengthening grass roots leadership. Washington, D.C.: Author.

Kearnes, D. L. (1988a, April 20). A business perspective on American schooling. Education Week, 7(30), 32, 24.

Kearnes, D. L. (1988b, April). An education recovery plan for America. Phi Delta Kappan, 69(8), 565-570.

Kirst, M. W. (1987, October). PEER: An interview with Michael Kirst. Phi Delta Kappan, 60(2), 161-164.

Lieberman, A. (1988, May). Teachers and principals: Turf, tension, and new tasks. Phi Delta Kappan, 69(9), 648-653.

Mann, D. (1975, May). What peculiarities in educational administration make it difficult to profess: An essay. The Journal of Educational Administration, 13(1), 139-147.

McCarthy, M. M. (1987, Winter). The professoriate in educational administration: Current status and challenges ahead. UCEA Review, 28(2), 2-6.

Miklos, E. (1983, Summer). Evolution in administrator preparation programs. Educational Administration Quarterly, 19(3), 153-177.

Miskel, C. (1988, October). Research and the preparation of educational administrators. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Cincinnati.

Mortimore, P., et al. (1988). Schools matter: The junior years. London: Open Books.

Murphy, J. (1989). An analysis of the reform movement of the 1980s on departments of educational administration in Illinois. Paper submitted for publication.

Murphy, J. (in press a). Educational reform in the 1980s: A comprehensive analysis. In J. Murphy (Ed.), The educational reform movement of the 1980s: Perspectives and cases. Berkeley: McCutchan.

Murphy, J. (in press b). School administration responds to pressures for change. In J. Murphy (Ed.), The educational reform movement of the 1980s: Perspectives and cases. Berkeley: McCutchan.

Murphy, J. (in press c). The reform of school administration: Pressures and calls for change. In J. Murphy (Ed.), The educational reform movement of the 1980s: Perspectives and cases. Berkeley: McCutchan.

Murphy, J. (1988a, Summer). Methodological, measurement, and conceptual problems in the study of instructional leadership. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 10(2), 117-139.

Murphy, J. (1988b). Principal instructional leadership. In L. S. Lotto & P. W. Thurston (Eds.), Recent advances in educational administration, (vol. 1). Grenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Murphy, J. (1988c, October). Bridging the gap between professors and practitioners in school administration: Factors to facilitate action at the university level. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the University Council for Educuational Administration, Cincinnati.

Murphy, J., & Hallinger, P. (Eds.) (1987). Approaches to administrative training. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Murphy, J., Hallinger, P., & Mitman, A. (1983, Fall). Problems with research on educational leadership: Issues to be addressed. Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis, 5(3), 297-305.

Murphy, J., Hallinger, P., Lotto, L. S., & Miller, S. K. (1987, December). Barriers to implementing the instructional leadership role. The Canadian Administrator, 27(3), 1-9.

National Association of Secondary School Principals (1985). Performance-based preparation of Principals: A framework for improvement. Reston, VA: Author.

National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983). A nation at risk. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Education.

National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (1987). Leaders for America's schools. Tempe, AZ: University Council for Educational Administration.

National Commission on Excellence in Teacher Education (1985). A call for change in teacher education. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

National Governors' Association (1986). Time for results: The Governors' 1991 report on education, chairman's summary. Washington, D.C.: Author.

National Governors' Association (1987). The Governors' 1991 report on education--time for results: 1987. Washington, D.C.: Author.

Nunnery, M. Y. (1982). Reform of K-12 educational administrator preparation: Some basic questions. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 15(2), 44-52.

National Science Board Committee (1983). Educating Americans for the 21st century. Washington, D.C.: Author.

Norton, M. S., & Levan, F. D. (1987, Winter). Doctoral studies of students in educational administration programs in UCEA member institutions. Educational Considerations, 14(1), 21-24.

Oakes, J. (1985). Keeping track: How schools structure inequality. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Page, R. N. (1984, April). Lower-track classes at a college-preparatory high school: A caricature of educational encounters. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

Pepper, J. B. (1988). Clinical education for school superintendents and principals: The missing link. In D. E. Griffiths et al. (Eds.), Leaders for America's schools. Berkeley: McCutchan.

Peterson, T. K. (1988, April). Building, passing, implementing and assessing educational reform in South Carolina. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

Peterson, K. D., & Finn, C. E. (1985, Spring). Principals, superintendents, and the administrator's art. The Public Interest, 79, 42-62.

Pitner, N. J. (1982, February). Training of the school administrator: State of the art. Eugene: Occasional paper from the University of Oregon, Center for Educational Policy and Management, College of Education.

Pitner, N. J. (1986, Spring). Substitutes for principal leader behavior: An exploratory study. Educational Administration Quarterly, 22(2), 23-42.

Powell, A. G., Farrar, E., & Cohen, D. K. (1985). The shopping mall high school: Winners and losers in the educational marketplace. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Rossmiller, R. A. (1986, Winter). Some contemporary trends and their implications for the preparation of educational administrators. UCEA Review, 27(1), 2-3.

Sedlak, M. W., Wheeler, C. W., Pullin, D. C., & Cusick, P. A. (1986). Selling students short: Classroom bargains and academic reform in the American high school. New York: Teachers College Press.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1989). The leadership needed for quality schooling. In T. J. Sergiovanni & Moore (Eds.), Schooling for tomorrow: Directing reforms to issues that count. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Sergiovanni, T. J. & Moore, J. H. (Eds.) (1989). Schooling for tomorrow: Directing reforms to issues that count. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Sizer, T. R. (1984). Horace's compromise: The dilemma of the American high school. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Slater, R. (1988, March). How does leadership affect teaching and learning? The School Administrator, 45(3), 13-15, 20.

Underwood, J. (1988). State legislative responses to educational reform literature. In L. S. Lotto and P. W. Thurston (Eds.), Recent advances in educational administration, (vol. 1). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

United States Department of Education (1986). What works: Research about teaching and learning. Washington, D.C.: Author.

United States Department of Education. (1987). Principal selection guide. Washington, D.C.: Author.

United States Department of Education (1988). American education: Making it work. Washington, D.C.: Author.

Wise, A. E. (1989). Professional teaching: A new paradigm for the management of education. In T. J. Sergiovanni & J. H. Moore (Eds.), Schooling for tomorrow: Directing reforms to issues that count. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.